

AZ Process Standardization Working Group Master Issues List

Table of Contents

<u>Issue #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
1.....	75
2.....	75
3.....	75
4.....	75
7.....	86
7.....	97
8.....	107
9.....	118
10.....	129
11.....	139
12.....	1340
13.....	1340
14.....	1340
15.....	1441
21.....	1441
16.....	1542
16.....	1643
43.....	1643
17.....	1743
18.....	1844
19.....	1945
24.....	2046
5.....	2147
20.....	2147
6.....	2147
22.....	2147
23.....	2248
57.....	2248
58.....	2349
59.....	2349
60.....	2449
62.....	2420
63.....	2420
72.....	2420

30	2621
31	2621
42	2621
49	2722
50	2722
51	2823
75	2823
76	2823
25	2924
33	3025
33	3126
35	3226
37	3227
39	3328
40	3428
41	3429
45	3529
53	3630
65	3832
66	3933
67	4033
68	4033
64	4134
71	4235
26	4336
27	4437
29	4538
32	4639
32	4740
44	4740
54	4841
34	4942
52	5043
38	5043
46	5144
47	5245
48	5346
55	5447

56	5548
28	5750
36	5851
61	5851
69	5851
70	5851
73	5952
74	5952
77	6053
78	6154
78	6355
79	6355
80	6355
81	6355
82	6456
1	5
2	5
3	5
4	5
7	6
8	7
9	8
10	9
11	9
12	10
13	10
14	10
15	11
21	11
16	12
16	13
43	13
17	13
18	14
19	15
24	16
5	17
20	17

6	17
22	17
23	18
57	18
58	19
59	19
60	19
62	19
63	19
72	20
30	21
31	21
42	21
49	22
50	22
51	23
75	23
76	23
25	24
33	25
33	26
35	26
37	26
39	27
40	27
41	28
45	28
53	29
65	31
66	32
67	32
68	32
64	33
71	34
26	35
27	36
29	37
32	38

32	39
44	39
54	40
34	41
52	42
38	42
46	43
47	44
48	45
55	46
56	47
28	49
36	50
61	50
69	50
70	50
73	51
74	51
77	52
78	53
79	54
80	54
81	54

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "1"}1	Tax Exempt: Does the ESP currently get Tax Exempt status on 810? Is the ESP required to have certificates for existing exempt customers?	Oct 13, 1999	New West Energy		Nov 10, 1999	Resolved. It is the end use customer responsibility to provide tax exemption status to each of their providers. 2/2/2000 Bill Rigsby – ACC will bring the tax statues to the Billing Subcom on 2/9/00 for clarification. This may be included in the recommendation.	E			Resolved. Revisited on 2/2/00 by the Billing Subcom.
{ TC "2"}2	Credit/Debit Amount by record	Oct 13, 1999	APS		Nov 10, 1999	This will be added to the Implementation Guide as an optional code. 2/2/2000 The above recommendation still applies.	E			Resolved. Revisited on 2/2/00 by the Billing Subcom.
{ TC "3"}3	Balance (BAL) vs. Total monetary value summary (TDS) for invoice payment. Issue for UDC, they cannot bill past due charges, since they may not be aware of payment amounts and dates.	Oct 13, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	UDC will not send payment information to the ESP since the ESP is covering the customer's receivable to the UDC. 2/2/2000 Resolution still stands. UDC will send current charges only for ESP consolidated billing. 2/8/00 This issue will be looked at when the IG is written	E 3			Pending. Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
{ TC "4"}4	Invoice Start & End Date do we need to state on bill?	Oct 13, 1999	Group		Oct 13, 1999	Rule Language R14-2-1617 States that "time period to which the reported information applies 2/2/2000 The proposed rule has changed. It was agreed that both parties shall disclose this information. Reference R14-2-210.	E			Resolved. Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "7" }7	How Rebate/Rebill will be handled?	Oct 26, 1999	APSES/New West Energy			<p>Further discussion needed. We need to confirm this as a business decision. Will this be handled as a cancel/rebill or adjustment line item? Once the discussion is complete – this can be translated to the EDI rule. This issue can be raised in the December 3rd Standardization Meeting.</p> <p>UIG – recommends the cancel/rebill scenario.</p> <p>Most UDCs can support the cancel/rebill scenario.</p> <p>The MRSP must post corrected 867s for retrieval by all parties. 3 categories of Billing Adjs. 1. Usage Related (dead meter, bad multiplier, etc.) Cancel/rebill 2. Rate related (incorrect rate calculation) Cancel/rebill 3. Non–usage related (flat rate, tax changes) Misc. Adjustment</p> <p>2/2/2000 This is still an issue. Another issue to consider, what happens if an ESP or UDC discovers a need to backbill and the customer has switched several times since the original billing took place. Reference ACC rules R14-2-210 section E. See Cancel and rebill discussion document. 3/8/00 Action items: APS will bring a copy of a real 810 showing a cancel rebill and how it is represented in the EDI format. All UDCs need to report on their cancel/rebill thresholds.</p> <p>All participants need to identify some of the business issues in relation to rebate/rebill and misc. adjustments. ESPs will bring real scenarios of their experiences in CA .. 3/22/00 Discussion took place to have a way of communicating specified rebate/rebill information outside of the 810 for the interim. Actions: UDC's to discuss the interim proposal and be prepared to discuss outcome. 4/6/00 UDC's: Still evaluating the long term and short term process</p> <p>Action: UDC's to complet review of items for rebill data.</p>	E 1			<p>Pending 4/19/00 Agenda</p> <p><u>Pending Resolution</u></p>

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "7" } 7 Con't	How Rebate/Rebill will be handled?	Oct 26, 1999	APSES/New West Energy			5/24/00 APS and TEP suggested changes to the BEN and the Rebate/Rebill notifications. Janie Mollon will incorporate the changes and distribute an implementation plan, an implementation guide and samples to the Billing Subcommittee for review by 6/6/00. The proposal notification processes will be presented at the 6/22/00 Billing and PSWG meetings. 6/22/00 Proposal was approved by the billing group.	E 1			Pending resolution

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "8" }8	UDC Information - Does the UDC have to pass the contact information address, etc. on each transaction – including the ACC phone number?	Oct 26, 1999	Group		2/24/00	<p>2/2/2000 Stacy reported that she contacted 2 ESPs. Their preference is to have static information such as emergency numbers, etc. not passed each time on the 810 document every time a customer bills.</p> <p>More discussion by market participants is needed.</p> <p>2/8/00 New West – If the UDCs continue to pass static data, they will null it in their system.</p> <p>Proposal: The UDC will provide the UDC emergency contact number and the ACC dispute phone number once. The ESP will provide this information on each bill. The UDC will advise the ESP 30 days written notice in advance of any change to this information.</p> <p>As of 2/24//00, the UDCs will make available to the PSWG a consolidated list of UDC Emergency Contact Numbers. It will be the responsibility of the UDCs to communicate to subsequent ESPs , the UDC Contact Number to and ACC dispute number to the ESP at the time of execution of the ESP Service Agreement.</p> <p>Long-term Solution: The UDC will provide the UDC emergency contact numbers and ACC number to the ESP at the time of certification with the UDC.</p> <p>2/24/00 Proposal above was accepted.</p>	E 2	X		Resolved

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "9" }9	Are tables graphs applicable this yr/last yr/last month?	Oct 26, 1999	Group		2/24/00	<p>This data will not be passed on the 810 to the ESP for Consolidated Billing.</p> <p>2/2/2000 Resolved pending rule investigation.</p> <p>2/8/00 No requirements found in the Rules. UDC will not pass this information and ESP is not required to print this information on the bill.</p> <p>2/24/00 Issue resolved. The 810 will not have a place to pass last months/last years consumption for the ESP to place in a table.</p>	E 2	X		Resolved

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "10" }10	Business, Regulatory Notices and advertising messages how we would handle? What would be the size (# of lines) and content and placement on the bill? For instance: disconnect notices, Levelized changes, capital credits. How do we anticipate handling non regulatory messages on the bill	Oct 26, 1999	Group		3/8/00	After further discussion it was decided that we need to offer a bill message field on the guide. This would be to pass Regulatory or Business information. Advertisements would be handled through contractual agreements between ESP and UDC. 2/2/2000 Action Item – utilities need to research their company's bill message size, # of characters, # of bill messages used. 2/8/00 Action items : UDC will come back with the type of bill messages we intend to send for ESP Consolidated billing. Shirley will bring information from CA, CUBR, UIG. Proposal for broadcast message types: The UDC will post ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory messages on their website in a timely manner and notify the ESP contact of record that there is a new message to be printed on the customer's bill. The ESP will retrieve the new message verbiage from the UDC's website. Proposal for customer specific messages: The UDC will pass the ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory message with the customer's bill data. This will transmit via the normal billing process agreed upon between the UDC and ESP. The ESP is required to print the message on the UDC portion of the consolidated bill. Advertising or business messages will not be passed by the UDC to the ESP for printing on the bill.	E 2	X		Resolved

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "11" }11	Will ESPs want to partake in SurePay? (Debit ESPs Bank Account for monies owed to the UDC)	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	If so, it is a contractual agreement between the ESP and the UDC. 2/2/2000 Resolution Applies	E			Resolved Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
{ TC "12" }12	3 rd party Billing (Should UDC continue to offer?)	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	This is an arrangement that will need to be made between the Biller (in this case the ESP) and their customer. 2/2/2000 Resolution applies.	E			Resolved Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
{ TC "13" }13	Payment Date appearing on customer's bill.	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	Payment Date, payment amount and payment received date will not be passed to the ESP on the 810 for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill. 2/2/2000 Resolution applies. Since the UDC does not know when or if a payment is actually received from the customer in ESP Consolidate Billing, this information will not be passed.	E			Resolved Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
{ TC "14" }14	Transmission Charge should it be displayed on the bill?	Oct 26, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	This will be settled with the Scheduling Coordinator. 2/2/2000 Any transmission charge identified as an end use customer charge will be included in the UDC portion of the bill. All other charges will be settled with the Scheduling Coordinator. Ex: Fixed must run charges are identified as an end use customer bill.	E, U, D			Resolved Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "15" }15	Does standardization need to allow for Summary Billing - ESP Consolidated Billing?	Nov 10, 1999	Group			<p>Further discussion – UDC would need to pass service periods. Would the UDC un-summarize the customer's bill for ESP Consolidated Billing?</p> <p>Opinions: New Energy – The Biller of the end use customer is the entity that should summarize the bill.</p> <p>TEP is not supporting summary billing for Direct Access customers due to cash flow issues. This is suggested in their proposed tariff (Article 24), but they have not been approved.</p> <p>2/2/2000 APSES – The Biller of the end use customer is the entity should summarize the bill.</p> <p>Barry Scott SSVEC -- I think the entity doing the billing should provide the consolidation. I believe the customers will resist having bills coming from all over the place. In some respects, this would be a step back to go from one bill for electrical service to many.</p>	E 3			Resolved
{ TC "21" }21	DA Market Issue – for UDC or Dual billing options, will Summary Billing be available for DA customers?	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/2/2000</p> <p>TEP will not offer Summary Billing per pending (Article 24)</p> <p>APS feels it is a billers service. If APS is the biller they will offer these services.</p> <p>SRP will offer these services for Dual or UDC Consolidate Billing.</p>	U, D 3			Pending

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "16" }16	Will ESPs be required to remit charitable contributions? (SHARE/Hero)	Nov 10, 1999	Group		See Issue 43	Further discussion on December 3 rd Standardization meeting. Opinions: New Energy –Does not want to be responsible for tracking and remitting funds back to the UDC for distribution to the charitable organizations. 2/2/2000 APSES agrees with New Energy's position. The ESP is liable for the remitting the pledge amounts to the UDC potentially before the customer actually pays the ESP. Barry Scott SSVEC I believe the entity producing the bill should be responsible for collecting the entire payment. They, in turn, should disburse the money accordingly. It will become a quagmire if each competitive entity only feels a responsibility to collect their piece of the pie. (How will we ever handle delinquents and partial payments?) This does not even consider the resentment the customers will feel about having to send checks to all of these diverse places to make sure their electrical bill is paid. I think this reasoning should apply to charitable programs as well, for example "Operation Roundup". 2/8/00 Who is responsible for the paper-work if the customer wants to remit charitable contributions 3/22/00 Discussion: Action: UDC's determine what their position is, why they do the SHARE program, the implications if they don't do it, and a proposal of how to handle this issue. 4/6/00 Bill Rigsby-Nothing in rules requiring UDC's or ESP's to remit charitable contributions. TEP will only offer charitable contributions for Dual Billing. They will not offer it with ESP Consolidated. Currently undecided on UDC Consolidated billing. APS-will continue to offer it on all billing options and will maintain the "paperwork". Trico-think they would offer it, but need to evaluate this further.	Billing Subcommittee			Pending Resolution
						E 3				

8/00 Revision 10
WG Master Issues List

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "16" }16 Con't	Will ESPs be required to remit charitable contributions? (SHARE/Hero)	Nov 10, 1999	Group		See Issue 43	4/6/00 (con't) Resolution: There are no regulatory requirements for the ESP ESP to remit payments. An agreed upon arrangement between the ESP and UDC would need to be in place to offer any charitable contributions.				Pending Resolution
{ TC "43" }43	Is there a regulatory requirement for UDCs to collect and remit charitable contributions to social agencies. Likewise, is there any regulatory requirement for ESP's to participate in collecting or remitting charitable contributions on behalf of an UDC.	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee		See Issue 16	2/2/2000 There is potential for state funds to be reduced because there potentially is no requirement to continue these programs.	Billing Subcommittee E 3			Pending

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "17" }17	Will the ESPs support levelized UDC billing line items?	Dec 1, 1999	Group		2/24/00	<p>It could be a hindrance for a customer to go Direct Access (in the case of a large debit balance) the ESPs would not want this large debit balance passed to them for payment.</p> <p>More input from the ESPs and UDCs is needed.</p> <p>2/2/2000 APS is planning to offer this option if they are the Billing entity.</p> <p>TEP is not planning to offer this billing option for DA Customers</p> <p>Barry Scott SSVEC I think any customer desiring to go to competitive access should settle all of their accounts with the UDC first. I believe if we will handle the process as we currently do for a customer going from one UDC to another we will be better off.</p> <p>2/8/00 – SRP will offer Levelized to customers for UDC Consolidated and Dual billing for distribution charges only. APS doesn't offer Levelized for ESP Consolidated. TEP doesn't offer levelized billing for DA customer regardless of the billing option.</p> <p>Proposal: The ESP has the option to offer levelized billing to the end use customer. The UDC will not pass levelized billing line items for ESP Consolidated billing.</p> <p>2/24/00 Above proposal accepted.</p>	E 2	X		Resolved

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "18" }18	For end use customer billing (dual billing situation) the ACC Rules are not specific about the responsibilities of what the utility is obligated to show on their bill and what the ESP is obligated to show on the bill.	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/2/2000 In many markets (CA specifically) beginning and ending meter reads need not be displayed on a bill. In the Arizona market the utilities are required to show specific pieces of information but it's unclear if the ESPs are required to follow the same rules.</p> <p>This could apply to all revenue cycle services.</p> <p>2/24/00 Bill Rigsby reported on the ACC Rules. Refer to sections in the ACC Rule R14-2-210B-2 and R14-2-1612. The verbiage states that ALL bills must contain the data elements referred to in these sections. Therefore, UDCs would be required to show a generation line item on their bill (dual billing) showing a zero amount due. Additionally, the ESP would be required to show a CTC charge on their portion of the bill with a zero amount due.</p> <p>Action Items : ESPs and UDCs create a proposal for a short term solution which may require filing for a waiver to the Rules as a short term solution. All parties to come up with possible long term changes to the Rules.</p> <p>Issue for MRSPs : Beginning and ending reads must be printed on the bill according to the Rules. Therefore these must be passed to the billing parties.</p> <p>3/8/00 Should a Rule change be suggested as a short-term solution. It is possible to put this in a combined waiver of issues that need to be changed in the Rules. A long term solution would be actually to change the verbiage.</p> <p>Action Items: ESPs and UDCs should come prepared with their company's position in regards to filing waivers. The group will come up with a proposal about how this issue should be resolved.</p> <p>3/14/00 It was decided to have a separate waiver filed for this issue (separate from #28,36, & 56)</p> <p>3/22/00 Proposed Resolution: The bill party needs to itemize the bill components to allow customer to break down/re-calculate</p>	E1			<p>Pending Resolution</p> <p>May require recommended Rule changes for resolution.</p>

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "19" }19	Once the troubleshooting process has taken place, and the UDC is estimating (an MRSP did not deliver the data in a timely manner or the read could not be retrieved), should the UDC transmit the estimation reasons for the ESP Consolidated Bill.	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			<p>The group needs to specify under what conditions the UDC could estimate a bill and pass this information to the ESP.</p> <p>2/24/00 Shirley Renfroe reported that the EDI 810 allows for an estimation reason code to be passed to the ESP.</p> <p>Proposed Resolution: If the MRSP fails to provide a meter read and the exception processing window has passed, the UDC may estimate and provide an indicator why the bill was estimated. The ESP is required to print this reason on UDC portion of the bill pursuant to Rule 14-2-210-6B.</p> <p>3/8/00 Reason codes need to be developed before this can be resolved.</p> <p>4/6/00 Resolution: We will use a reason code of: Meter Data not available</p>	E 1			Pending Resolution

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "24" }24	When the UDC estimates the bill in ESP Consolidated billing, an agreed upon process and timeframe needs to be set for troubleshooting before the bill is actually sent to the customer.	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee – Marilyn Ferrara			<p>2/2/2000 This is a meter reading to data input billing issue. Examples include the CA model – MADEN Meter and Data Exception Notice. Could be impacted by VEE rule differences, etc.</p> <p>2/24/00 Janie Mollon is preparing a suggested model for Arizona to report billing and metering exceptions. Janie will send out proposal and suggestions. Members are to look at and send back comments to Janie. (Recommendation, timeline, with your proposed modification.) Janie will compile for next meeting.</p> <p>3/8/00 The Billing Subcommittee agreed that an exception process such as the MADEN is needed for handling exceptions. The MADEN process will be submitted to the Policy Subcommittee for standardization across all subcommittee exception process. All committee members should review the document in it's entirety and be prepared to discuss implementation issues. Stacy Aguayo will check with CA UDCs to see if more MADEN information is available.</p> <p>Action Item: UDCs need to re-evaluate the time frame of estimation. Is there any flexibility before estimating? What notifications should/are in place for notifying MRSPs of missing data?</p> <p>3/22/00 take the BEN proposal to our companies and discuss the possibility of implementing this notification process</p> <p>Be prepared to talk about a possible implementation guidelines</p> <p>4/6/00 Action:UDC's need to determine how many days after the read due date will the ESP/MRSP be notified of missing data and how many days does the MSP have to get data after notification before the UDC estimates?</p> <p>Action: If the MRSP estimates their reads and the estimates cause an exception to produce, can the UDC estimate on an estimate?</p> <p>Action: UDC"s check the "tolerance" level of their VEE rules</p>	E, U and D 1			Pending 4/19/00 Agenda

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "5" }5	Reason of Estimate - Do both parties need to give?	Oct 13, 1999	Group		Nov 10, 1999	No. It is the Billers responsibility to print this in the bill using the 867 standard estimation reason codes. See Business Rules. 2/2/2000 Resolution stands.	E			Resolved.
{ TC "20" }20	Can other utility service charges be passed to the ESP for Consolidated Billing (gas, water, sewer, telephone, etc.)	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee			2/2/2000 This may not be in the scope of the PSWG charge. We are focusing on the transfer of electric information only. This may need to be addressed at a later date.	E 3			Resolved
{ TC "6" }6	Should non-utility charges be included on ESP consolidated bills?	Oct 13, 1999	New West Energy		Nov 10, 1999	UDC cannot pass charges for non-utility related charges for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill. Example: home security, Internet services 2/2/2000 Resolution stands.	E			Resolved Revisited by the 2/2/00 Billing Subcom.
{ TC "22" }22	If a customer has a credit or debit balance on the bill when they switch to DA, is the utility obligated to refund that money?	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee		3/8/00	2/8/00 Levelized / Equalizer was briefly discussed regarding the debit or credit balances 2/24/00 In APS territory, they will final out the standard offer account and bill the customer separately if there is a debit. If the customer does not pay and is eligible for disconnect, they notify the ESP. If there is a credit they will refund this to the customer prior to the switch for DA. Pending Resolution: At the time the customer goes DA and they have a credit balance, with the exception of Capital credits, the UDC will apply it to any outstanding receivable owing. They will then refund the remaining credit directly to the customer in accordance to their applicable Rules and Regulations. At the time the customer goes DA and the customer has a debit balance, it will be the sole responsibility of the UDC to collect the money from the customer.	E 1			Resolved

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "23" }23	If the utility is holding a deposit for the customer and the customer switches to ESP consolidated billing, is the utility required to refund the entire deposit since the receivable is paid to the UDC by the ESP?	2/2/2000	Billing Subcommittee		4/6/00	<p>Stacy went over flow chart for Deposit Process for ESP Consolidated billing and Deposit Process for UDC consolidated billing. (See attachement to Billing minutes for 2/24/00)</p> <p>3/8/00 There is no formal Rule requirement dictating deposit refunds for ESP Consolidated billing customers. The current business processes have been identified (see flow) for TEP, SRP and APS. Other UDCs can submit their deposit business processes to theBilling Subcommittee Chairperson. Deposit requirements are to be determined by the individual companies based on their individual credit policies. No further action needed.</p>				Resolved
{ TC "57" }57	How will we handle customer bill disputes that are filed with the ACC for ESP Consolidated Billing.	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/8/00 Bill will check at the ACC how often customers file complaints with the ACC for bill disputes. How will UDCs handle the requirement for the ESP to make us whole?</p> <p>Action: Bill to check at the ACC for proposed changes</p> <p>4/6/00 Bill Rigsby- Believes the ACC will be notifying both the ESP and UDC regarding any consumer disputes.</p> <p>Resolution: The billing subcommittee will make a formal recommendation within the report to have the ACC notify both the ESP and UDC of any formal dispute.</p>	Billing Subcommittee E			Pending Resolution

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "58" }58	How will bill inserts be handled for ESP Consolidated billing as it relates to mandated regulatory messages?	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee		4/6/00	<p>2/8/00 ESPs will not print marketing messages on their bill. In CA, UDCs have to submit their inserts to the CPUC for review. If there is marketing language in the inserts, the UDCs have to remove the language. ESPs also have an opportunity to review all messages prior to distribution to the customer</p> <p>Action: Be prepared to discuss this issue. UDC's determine processes for removing marketing language from mandatory messages.</p> <p>4/6/00 TEP will strip their marketing messages from the mandated bill messages APS will not be send bill messages electronically</p> <p><u>5/24/00 NWE would prefer to receive these electronically. They prefer to have it sent electronically and then they will print the message/stuffer with the bill.</u></p> <p><u>TEP agreed that they will send the insert electronically (email with a document attached) and/or post it to their website. APS will check to see if they can accommodate this proposal.</u></p> <p><u>Action Items : APS will check to see if they can create a WORD document (not PDF) so the ESP can transfer the data to the bill.</u></p> <p><u>6/22/00 An agreement will need to be made between the ESP and UDC on how the marketing messages will be delivered (website, e-mail etc.)</u></p>	Billing Subcommittee E Priority # 2			Pending Resolution
{ TC "59" }59	Need clarification on estimating rules specifically section 210-A3-5	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			<p>2/8/00 Confusion about the load profiled customer or customers needing load data. Does this have anything to do with real time pricing?</p>	Billing Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
{ TC "60" }60	According to the rules, a third party can be back billed up to 12 months. What will the process be for back-billing third parties? (R14-21-E3)	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			2/22/00 According to the rules, there are specifics on how utilities bill a 3 rd party but there is no specification for any other market participants. (R14-2-210-E3)	Billing Subcommittee Priority #2			Pending
{ TC "62" }62	If back billing is required for period where the customer is both Standard Offer and DA, for ESP Consolidated Billing, the ESPs will want to bill/pay only the DA period	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee		Refer issue #7	3/22/00 Janie to bring California options to next meeting. Action: UDC's to see how can supply intermittent data. 4/6/00 ESP's proposal: Current bill agent will bill for current charges. The original bill agent will be responsible to bill the re-bill period for which they had the relationship with the consumer. Dual Billing will be used as a back-up default when an original ESP is no longer in business or by Mutual agreement by all parties involved.	Billing Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending 4/19/00 agenda
{ TC "63" }63	If UDC or ESP charges are not transmitted by the drop dead date/time, what is the responsibility of the biller to include language on the bill advising the customer of missing charges.	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee				Billing Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending 3/8/00 agenda
{ TC "72" }72	How are adjustments going to be handled in the 810.	2/24/00	Billing Subcommittee		Refer to issue #7	How will we communicate reason for Misc. adjustments. 4/6/00 UDC's to come up with list of the various adjustments made on a bill and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting. 5/24/00 A list of adjustments was compiled and will be inserted into the implementation guides for the BEN and the Rebate/Rebill notification processes.	Billing Group Priority #1			Pending 4/19/00 agenda
73	<u>How are non-metered services going to be handled? What are the charges going to be? Who is responsible to maintain/bill for the services?</u>	<u>6/22/00</u>	<u>Billing Subcommittee</u>			<u>6/22/00</u> <u>Action: Each entity must be prepared to discuss this issue in the next meeting.</u>				<u>Pending for July meeting</u>

BILLING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report1	ACC	
<u>74</u>	<u>If a customer is switching from DA back to standard offer or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what can/should the UDC and/or ESP do to retrieve the missing data? How can the final bill get trued-up? Should the UDC/ESP be allowed to estimate the final bill? Etc.</u>	<u>6/22/00</u>	<u>Billing Subcommittee</u>			<u>6/22/00</u> <u>Action: Each entity to provide their solutions on how to handle this issue.</u>				<u>Pending for July meeting</u>

REMITTANCE & TRANSACTION ERROR ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "30" }30	Do we need to prioritize transactions by importance due to financial considerations and customer service (for problem resolution and cycle time of EDI 824)?	1/27/00	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee	2/3/00	Resolution Pending 2/8/00	1/27/00 For example, SRP requires acknowledgement both incoming and outgoing within 24 hours. All subcommittees need to define transaction cycle time.	Remittance and Error Reporting Subcommittee			Resolution Pending 2/8/00
{ TC "31" }31	Is there a need to standardize dual path or single path when handling the 820? Do we provide a remittance advice directly to the ESP and payment directly to the bank (dual path)? OR do both documents go directly to the bank? (single path)	1/27/00	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee	2/3/00		Payments go to bank and details go to provider. Since most banks are currently using VANS, sending both transactions may be costly to the sending parties.	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee			Pending
{ TC "42" }42	Will we require an 824 on all transaction (accepted or take exception to a data element). Do we only want to get an 824 when there's a problem with data?	2/1/2000	Policy Subcommittee				Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "49" }49	Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. The business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in. Customer Moving: - Notification of direct access customer moving to new address within the same distribution company territory without having to return to bundled service.	1/25/00	APSES			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or the UDC to implement a request, as provided by the proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until the out-bound/in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending
{ TC "50" }50	Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. The business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in. New Customer - Same Facility: - A new customer takes over an existing direct access facility, keeps same ESP and meter without returning to bundled service.	1/25/00	APSES			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or the UDC to implement a request, as provided by the proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until the out-bound/in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending

DASR/ENROLLMENT ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "51" }51	Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. The business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in. . "Account Update" - Notification of changed account information. [The UC and PD DASRs appear to be both in/out-bound in the Arizona DASR Handbook	1/25/00	APSES			Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or the UDC to implement a request, as provided by the proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until the out-bound/in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending
{ TC "75" }75	On the incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. The state DASR handbook does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations.		Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee				DASR Subcommittee			Pending
{ TC "76" }76	On the DASR – the forecasted meter owner is a required field. Is this appropriate? Should this be taken off of the RQ DASR?		Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			In step 3 of the Metering Business processes, the pending meter owner is also required. The meter owner may change from the time the DASR is set to the time the meter is exchanged.	DASR Subcommittee			Pending

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "25" }25	What specific VEE rules should utilities use on an ongoing basis to verify and bill off of incoming MRSP reads.	1/26/00	Billing Subcommittee			<p>1/26/00 - Since MRSPs use different algorithms, it's difficult for utilities to determine if MRSPs are performing VEE on an ongoing basis. If the utilities use their own VEE systems to verify reads it may cause invalid rejections.</p> <p>2/1/00 – What is the utilities responsibility to audit the MRSPs? The rules state this certification must take place yearly.</p> <p>4/27/00 A sub/subgroup was formed to review the existing VEE rules, develop objectives, changes and proposals (if needed), develop performance measures and monitoring criteria. TEP (Tony Gillooly), APSES, New West Energy (Janie Mollon), C3 Comm, CSC, APS, SRP (Greg Carrel), a representative from the coop (possibly Barry Scott), and possibly First Point. Renee Castillo volunteered to chair this sub/subgroup and will set up a meeting with these participants.</p> <p><u>5/18/00 The VEE subgroup is now a subcommittee which will be meeting on 5/25 at New West Energy. The group is going through the detail of the CA Rules and compiling a document of Rules that will fit the Arizona model. The Subcommittee will meet officially on 6/20/00.</u></p>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Pending

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "33" }33	For access to a meter, some UDCs require the ESP to get keys, combos, etc. from the customer. In many cases, the customer does not have the key.	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>2/3/00 APS is not going to provide keys to the MSP. They would like the MSP to get the key from the customer.</p> <p>Issues: Customers may not have keys. Utility keys may not be able to be duplicated. Or utilities may want to offer a dual locking device on a contractual basis with utilities and MSPs.</p> <p>New West Energy – This is a barrier to getting access to change meters for customers to go DA. <u>Suggestion</u> - If the customer is releasing their customer data (historical) anyhow, could the key process be incorporated in the release?</p> <p>Action Item: All Utilities need to research what their key policy is and report to subcommittee by 2/16/00.</p> <p>Janie Mollon will bring CA access process.</p> <p>Per Jamie – Schlumberger – In the case of customer's lock, they are just cutting the lock and then supplying a new lock to the customer. The customer is then responsible for getting a key to the UDC for access to the site.</p> <p>Per Marv Buck – CUBR is suggesting that the UDCs change customer supplied locks with UDC supplied locks. Then the UDC retains possession of the master key and they can supply the customer with slave keys for them to get to the MSP and ESP.</p> <p>Pending Resolution: For customer supplied locks, the MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply the customer with a new lock and keys. It is the customer's responsibility to get the new key to the UDC. The MSP will communicate access changes back to the UDC on the MIRN form in the remarks section.</p> <p>CUC Comments: The UDC requires access to metering equip on the custs premises for safety reasons and already have keys that were supplied to the customer. The ESP should be responsible for supplying the UDC with a key to any lock changed on the customer's metering room. It is not responsible to require the customer to produce</p>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee	Priority #1	MSP and MRSP issue	Pending

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "33" }33 Con't	For access to a meter, some UDCs require the ESP to get keys, combos, etc. from the customer. In many cases, the customer does not have the key.	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>New Proposal 6/21/00: For: For customer supplied locks, the MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply the customer with a new lock and keys. The MSP will place a secured mutually agreed upon dual hasp locking device on with the customer's lock and a UDC supplied lock. then seal up the other hole on the hasp. This will be indicated on the MIRN form for the UDC to replace the seal with an UDC lock. — If the MSP cuts a UDC lock, they will replace it with a mutually agreed upon secured dual locking device dual hasp with a new customer lock and a seal where the UDC lock will be placed a UDC supplied lock. This will be noted on the MIRN form and the UDC will replace the seal in their normal course of business.</p> <p><u>5-18-00 Janet Henry from Phaser stated that CA will give the MSP keys to their locks and lockboxes. — A question was asked "who is responsible/liable during the time the MSP cuts the UDC lock and the time the UDC gets back out there to replace their lock?" Solution: UDCs provide the MSPs with padlocks to seal the UDC side of the locking device.</u></p> <p><u>Action Items for June 21: UDC will determine if the can give a supply of UDC locks to the MSPs operating in their territory</u></p> <p><u>6/21/00 See above proposal.</u></p>				Pending Resolution 6/21/00

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "35" }35	At what point does an ESP take responsibility on a meter exchange? And who is responsible for energy consumption during the exchange?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			2/3/00 Action Items: Utilities need to report on their processes on 2/16/00. Pending Resolution: The time in which the ESP takes responsibility depends on the switch procedures in the separate UDC territories. <u>5-18-00 Resolved</u>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee Priority #1			<u>Resolved</u> <u>5-18-00</u> <u>Pending Resolution</u> <u>5/18/00</u>
{ TC "37" }37	Load research meters- Are the UDCs intending have to a dual meter installed or are they going to pick another sample customer when the customer goes DA? Also, will the UDCs allow the ESPs to use existing phone line for to read the meter for DA purposes? Or vice versa.....can the UDC use ESP phone lines?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			2/3/00 Action Items: Utilities to document and report what the process will be for handling Load Research meter by 2/16/00. 2/16/00 SRP will choose new sample. In most cases phone line is owned by the customer APS will choose new sample. In a few cases they will remove their existing phone line. 4/27/00 Please refer to the UDC Business Rule Comparison to be included with the PSWG report to the Commission. <u>5-18-00 – Resolved</u>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee Priority #1			<u>Resolved</u> <u>5-18-00</u> <u>Pending Resolution</u> <u>5/18/00</u>

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "39" }39	Do the DA meters installed have to have a visual display? Why? This limits the equipment types that can be installed?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>2/3/00 The TR Recorder does not have a display. The requirement came from a EUSERC.</p> <p>Action Items: Utilities need to report on their needs for the display by 2/16/00. Jeanine/APS will check with the EUSERC requirements. ESPs will report on what impacts this requirement could have in their orgs.</p> <p>According to ANSI a displayed is not 'required'. Further discussion is needed. Metering boxes are the way the technology is moving....therefore, no display. This may be a customer issue.</p> <p>Utilities to report on why a display is needed.</p> <p>Darrel Pichoff to check with RUCO to see if there's a requirement.</p> <p>3/2/00 Per Prem Bahl of RUCO: RUCO's position is: there must be a visual display on all electric meters for residential consumers. The consumer must be able to read the kWh and kW readings. RUCO will insist on this.</p> <p>K.R. Saline represents 24 Irrigation Districts, Electrical Districts, and Municipalities. KRS will insist on visual displays on electric meters for both residential and commercial customers.</p> <p>4/27/00 This is to be addressed in an upcoming meeting since this issue is currently happening in production today.</p>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Pending

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "40" }40	What are the UDCs processes for scheduling MSP work? What if an MSP picks a date to remove and install a meter and the schedule must be changed? How are these exceptions handled?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			2/3/00 This issue may be addressed when we start to review the data elements. The utilities must be able to speak to the schedules on metering. 4/27/00 The MDCR and procedures address this issue. See UDC Business Rul Comparison document.	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending Resolution 6-21-00 Pending Resolution 5/18/00
40 Cont.	What are the UDCs processes for scheduling MSP work? What if an MSP picks a date to remove and install a meter and the schedule must be changed? How are these exceptions handled? (CONTINUED)					5-18-00 Will discuss the option of submitting MDCRs on Thursday for all work anticipated for the following week (similar to CA) for territories without blackout windows. This will be discussed at the 6-21-00 meeting. Action Items: UDCs will review the latest proposal for scheduling of meter exchanges and report back at the 6-21-00 meeting.				
{ TC "41" }41	Who is responsible for validating that a meter can be read after a MSP has set a new meter?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			1/27/00 In CA, it's a requirement from CPUC (Rule 22), the ESP is responsible for ensuring that the newly installed meter can be read prior to 1 st billing by the MRSP or face penalties. 2/3/00 Per00 Per 1 st Point – This is usually done at the meter install time. 4/27/00 This will be addressed in the VEE sub/subgroup.	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "45" }45	Standardization data content, data format and data transmission is needed for Metering Data.	2/3/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>2/3/00 Fax and email are not acceptable forms of data transmission. Trading Partners are not able to populate their databases.</p> <p>4/27/00 The subgroup has standardized the data content, the data format and a basic transmission method (email with Excel spreadsheet). Additional electronic methods will be explored.</p> <p><u>5-18-00 Resolved</u></p>	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p><u>Resolved</u></p> <p><u>5-18-00</u></p> <p><u>Pending</u></p> <p><u>Resolution</u></p> <p><u>5/18/00</u></p>

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "53" }53	ISSUE: Blackout period for Direct Access meter exchanges is too long and is not consistent between UDCs.	1/25/00	APSES			<p>Currently, the 3 largest UDCs require that meters that need to be exchanged for Direct Access service cannot be exchanged for a period of time around the current meter's read date. The length of time varies by UDC, but extends up to approximately 9 working days for one UDC. This requirement is problematic for ESPs and MSPs because it effectively allows meters to be exchanged during only half of the month for each account (9 working days equates to approximately half of a calendar month). When a customer has multiple accounts on multiple read cycles that all require meter exchanges, the MSP must plan their installation schedule around the UDC blackout period. This makes it virtually impossible to exchange multiple meters on consecutive days during the month. Since most certified MSPs are installing meters with out-of-state personnel, this requirement adds to the cost of meter exchanges for MSPs and ultimately for ESPs and customers. RECOMMENDATION: The Metering Working Group should examine the process for meter exchanges and shorten or eliminate the blackout period requirement. The group should look at best practices in other states where blackout periods have been eliminated or greatly reduced to foster a more efficient competitive market. Where possible, the blackout periods should be consistent across the UDCs in the state.</p> <p>Suggestion from Janie Mollon – NWE: To switch a customer MSP could not install a meter 5 workdays before a read date or 2 workdays after a read date. The actual switch happens on the read date.</p> <p>3/16/00 Jim Wontor APSSES brought another proposal. Eliminate blackout periods and allow customer's to switch on exchange date.</p> <p>Action Item: The ESPs will consolidate their proposals for a best practice suggestion on 3/30/00.</p> <p>4/27/00 SEE the ESP Hybrid proposal addressing switch dates and blackout windows. Also, see the</p>	Metering Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending_- to be re-evaluated January 1, 2001

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
53 Con't	Blackout period for Direct Access meter exchanges is too long and is not consistent between UDCs.	1/25/00	APSES			<p>Consensus was not reached between TEP, SRP and APS, APS operates currently without a blackout window even though their Schedule 10 allows for a blackout window. SRP does not operates withouta blackout window. TEP operates with a 5 wkday blackout window.</p> <p>Action Items: APS need to find out how long they are willing to work without for 6 mos. a blackout window. TEP will check with their staff to see if they will work with the 5 wkday blackout window and then reevaluate in 6 mos.</p> <p>Navopache (Dennis Hughes) would agree to work with the 5 wkday blackout window with the agreement to reevaluate any market impacts after 6 months.</p> <p>Trico – (Anne Cobb) They certainly see advantages to having a blackout period. They would agree to work with the blackout window with the agreement to reevaluate any market impacts after 6 months.</p> <p><u>5-18-00 – Citizen's and APS will agree to work without a blackout window for 6 months and re-evaluate 1-1-01.</u></p> <p><u>TEP, Navopache & Trico – Will keep 5-day blackout window and re-evaluate in 6 months on 1-1-01.</u></p> <p><u>SRP – will work without a blackout window as they are currently doing now and re-evaluate in 6 months 1-1-01.</u></p>			Pending	

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "65" }65	The Arizona 867requires the MRSPs or UDCs to pass billing reads. Is this necessary? Could the Interval data only be passed? Then the UDC/ESP would be responsible for creating the billing reads. Determine if the read will be encoded or calculated.	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>Action: Confirm that it is a requirement to have both beginning and ending reads. Yes this is a requirement.</p> <p>3/16/00 Per APS – Joe Webster, They need both the interval and billing reads. This is used for the VEE process. They would need reads off of the register (encoded), not calculated reads.</p> <p>Per SRP – Greg Carrel – on interval data accounts, they bill off of the interval data only. The interval data is VEEed on the interval data.</p> <p>Per Navapache – Dennis Hughes – They have approx 7,000 interval data accounts. However, they bill off of the billing reads.</p> <p>Per TEP – On very select occasions, they will bill off of IDR data. However, they will validate on the billing reads.</p> <p>Action Item: A small subcommittee will review possible solutions to this issue: Marv Buck, Janie Mollon, Tim Jones, Kimane Aycock, Joe Webster, Darrell Shear, Greg Carrel, and reps from TEP. They will report back to Metering Subcommittee on 4/13/00.</p> <p>4/27/00 See the UDC/ESP Proposal. CUC sent comments that their company does not support this proposal. Dennis Hughes reported that AEPCO does not support this proposal. The subgroup took a vote to bring the issue up to the large PSWG meeting and only 2/3 majority was reached. The subgroup decided that further discussion was needed. Renee Castillo and Marv Buck will develop a memo to be sent out to the large PSWG. We will set aside 1 hour of discussion to take place immediately after the PSWG meeting on 5/3/00 at the Mesa Conference Center. All market participants are encouraged to attend the discussion.</p>	Metering Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
65 Cont.						5-18-00 The group reviewed the proposal as well as Sulpher Springs corrections to the proposal. SSVEC will only accept register reads and not accept calculated reads from the MRSPs. -- It was agreed to escalate this issue to the May 31st PSWG meeting for open discussion. Dennis Hughes and Ann Cobb will research with the other Cooperatives to see what the real issue is and what options may be available. Dennis Hughes confirmed with Paul Michaud that the Cooperatives did not agree to calculated reads. 6/21/00 SRP and TEP have no implementation issues. APS will provide implementation schedule at next meeting. Triocr, Navapache, and Citizens have no concerns with this issue.				
{ TC "66" }66	How are the UDCs identifying the master meter and then showing subsequent sub-meters? Is there a common way to identify the meters with the same address with multiple meters? Currently the UDC issues one MI form per meter.	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Action: Identify how the UDCs are handing totalized metering and sites with multiple meters. 4/27/00 This is identified on the new EMI forms. 5-18-00 - Resolved	Metering Subcommittee Priority #3			Resolved 5-18-00 Pending Resolution 5/18/00

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "67" }67	If a master metered account goes DA, does the ESP lose grandfathered agreements to continue with the master metering?	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>This is an action item for the UDCs.</p> <p>Dave Rumolo will research FERC requirements.</p> <p>4/27/00 Dennis Hughes to follow up with Dave to check and see what the status is of this issue.</p> <p><u>5-18-00 –Action Item: Dennis Hughes will check to see if there are any FERC requirements. Janet Henry will see if this came up in CA and how it was handled. Bob Grey will run this issue by commission staff to see if they have any input on this.</u></p>	Metering Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending
{ TC "68" }68	Site Meets – What are the UDCs policies?	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			<p>This will be added to the Business Rule Document.</p> <p>The UDC policies and procedures have been added to the Business Rule Comparison Document.</p>	Metering Subcommittee Priority #1			Resolved

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "64" }64	<p>How many decimal places should be required before applying the multiplier to a demand read?</p> <p>How many decimal places should be required for billing demand?</p> <p>Issue: In the 867, when we convert the kW back to a read how many decimals places need to be accommodated?</p> <p>Issue: Do we want the MRSP to give us usage/multiplier or give us the actual read (w/ two decimal places)?</p>	2/16/00	Policy Group		4/13/00 mtg of metering sub committee 2 decimal places	<p>Action: Can CIS multipliers be changed to “one” since the MRSP is adding in the multiplier to the demand provided in the 867.</p> <p>Review the 867 guideline to determine if the billing demand posted should have the multiplier applied to it. – The MSP is required to apply the multiplier to the demand.</p> <p>Action Item: Utilities need to research when a demand figure is received from an MRSP, what is their process for backing out the multiplier and extracting the read.</p> <p>Considerations: Decimal points accommodated and having different multipliers for demand meters in the CIS systems.</p> <p>Action: Check 867 requirements to ensure we are all on the same page. Check for all issues pertaining to the 867 (issue #64, #46, & #65)</p> <p>3/16/00 What is happening on the MRSP reads, the reads are coming with inconsistent . Some are coming with 1 decimal place, while others are being shown with up to 4 decimal places. The problem is that the UDCs take demand reads up to 2 decimal places. Anu more than 2 decimal places are either truncated or rounded by the UDCs in order to bill. This could cause the demand calculation to be off from what the other party would be billing.</p> <p>Possible Solution: The MRSP can deliver the read rounding to 2 decimal places. Or the demand be figured on the interval data only.</p> <p>Both the ESP and the UDC would have to bill of of the same value (kW figured on read or interval data) to ensure the same billing kW figure.</p> <p>Currently the ESPs are not billing on demand. This will be come a when they decide to start billing the demand. If they were to bill off of the demand, they would extract it from the interval data. Although the read would still need to be supplied for VEE.</p> <p>Action Item: The participants need to go back to their companies to see if they can handle kW reads to 2 decimal places. Are the porties willing to say that this would be the standard.</p> <p>CUC comments – Their system is not set up to bill multpliers already applied. This will cause manual work on our billing staff and potentially result in billing errors.</p>	Metering Group	Priority #1	Resolved	

8/00 Revision 10

WG Master Issues List

41

METERING SYSTEM AND METER READING ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "71" }71	If after receiving an RQ DASR and the UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or I turn off a customer prior to the switch, what is the process to notify the ESP that the customer will be disconnected.	2/24/00	Billing Subcommittee			Defining Issue: This particular issue focuses more on how the metering side is handled when this type of issue arises. How to stop the meter exchange process. 4/27/00 This will be reviewed when additional business processes are reviewed.	Metering Group Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "26" }26	XML versus EDI What is XML? Should this be considered for a best practice for the Arizona's model?	1/25/00	ACC Staff – Deb Scott and Jerry Smith			1/25/00 – This is an issue for the policy group to investigate. This is not a transport mechanism, it is defined as a data structure. 2/1/00 – Ray Wensel, Excelergy, offered to coordinate a presentation to the PSWG on XML. Evelyn Dryer will address with ACC and possibly get this on a large group agenda.	Policy Group Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "27" }27	<p>Companies are defining 'workdays' for time frames for work to be completed. The problem is that some companies are including holidays that are not recognized by others. Need to define 'standardized workday'.</p> <p>Suggested Resolution: NERC holidays recognized but modified. If a NERC holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday and if the holiday falls on a Sunday it is recognized on a Monday.</p> <p>Standardized Work Days: Any day except Saturday/Sunday or NERC holiday. If holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday. If the holiday falls on a Sunday, it is recognized on a Monday.</p>	1/26/00	Billing Subcommittee		2/29/00	<p>1/26/00 For example: In some territories Columbus Day, MLK Day are recognized as holidays and are excluded from a workday calculation. This could effect time periods defined for metering, meter reading, Consolidated billing and enrollment.</p> <p>2/1/00 – Standardization of holidays may not be possible.</p> <p>Suggestion 1: If a Federal or State Holidays are defined, these could be used as an exception to workdays for ALL participants.</p> <p>Suggestion 2: Use NERC definition of holiday. Evelyn Dryer to provide to the Policy Group.</p> <p>Action Item for Policy Group: All participants need to take these suggestions to their organizations to see what will work. Items to consider: Cash flow, bill cycles, read cycles, settlement etc. Also, Please bring a list of your organizations recognized holidays. Be prepared to discuss impact to company's if we recommend NERC holidays only, OR if we were to recognize all State and Federal Holidays. Due by 2/15/00</p> <p>Darrell Pichoff to bring list of Postal/Federal Holidays.</p> <p>Steve Olea to bring list of State Holidays.</p> <p>2/16/00 – Pending Resolution (see UDC holiday matrix – enclose with minutes).</p>	Policy Group Priority #1	x		Resolved

POLICY ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "29" }29	Are 997s required for all transactions? Is that going to be our recommendation for the Arizona standards?	1/27/00	Remittance Advice and Error Reporting Subcommittee	2/3/00		1/27/00 997s are an industry standard transaction (EDI syntax validation) 2/1/2000 – Yes a 997 acknowledgement is required on all standardized EDI transaction sets. Policy group will recommend that the level of acknowledgement should be determined by the individual trading partners. 2/8/00 – Is a 997 required for meter data that is extracted from a MRSP web site?	Policy Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "32" }32	What is the true costs of CT/VT (PT) if an ESP wants to buy the equipment? Cost to replace equipment at today's market price OR cost to UDC and depreciated by years since installation.	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See issue 44 &54	#23,44, & 54: Renee will have more information regarding these items for the 3/8/00 meeting. 3/7/00 (ref: 32,44,&54) Suggestions: lease CT/PT/VT's or have a long- term purchase plan. APSES/Jim W: will contact California to see how they handle CT PT ownership issues. Action: UDC's discuss w/ companies lease agreements, long term pymt plans and their defense on why want to own them. Action: Clarify rule 14-2-1612-K10. Action: All market participants review rule 14-2-1612-K10. Determine if want to interpret/re-word using UDC shall own, UDC shall not own, may own or may own at the discretion of the customer. Be prepared to defend/come to a consensus. 3/14/00 Costs range from roughly \$230-\$3500 Action: ESP's to provide more detail regarding the long-term payment plan (how much/how long). APS/TEP will not support a leasing option APS will support the payment plan option only if for the life of the contract between the ESP & customer. 3/22/00 Discussion: ESP's don't want to resort to a lease/pymt plan option until the issue of the UDC's maintaining ownership of the CT/PT's has been resolved.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1		Pending	

3/00 Revision 10
WG Master Issues List

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "32" }32 Con't	What is the true costs of CT/VT (PT) if an ESP wants to buy the equipment? Cost to replace equipment at today's market price OR cost to UDC and depreciated by years since installation.	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See issue 44 &54	5/9/00 TEP – Per Position document issued by Tony Gilooly, they are still working on the costs. APS – Installed equipment - material and labor, depreciated by 5 years. SRP – SRP is in the process for developing IT equipment costs for full metering competition scheduled for 12/31/00. Mohave and Navopche – Would support selling the Its at the Fair market cost that it takes to replace the equipment Sulfer Srpings – Current Book Value minus depreciation				Pending
{ TC "44" }44	Clarify ownership of CT and VTs (PT) based on voltage level.	2/3/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See issue 32 & 54	2/3/00 Group will refer to ACC Rules. 5-9-00 – Refer to Business Rule Comparison document from the Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee group.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending Resolution for 5-23-00

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "54" }	Ownership of Current Transformers (CTs) and Voltage Transformers (VTs formerly known as PTs) is not consistent across UDCs.	1/25/00	APSES		See issue 32 & 44	: The ACC rules for Direct Access and the Electric Competition Act provide for a UDC to own and maintain both CTs and VTs. However, the interpretation of these rules differs by UDC. One UDC mandates that CT/VTs be purchased by the Customer or the ESP/MSP if they are below a certain voltage size. Another UDC maintains ownership and maintenance responsibilities of CT/VTs for all Customers, and the third major UDC maintains ownership of the CT/VTs, but requires the ESP/MSP to maintain them. This inconsistency creates difficulty for an ESP, especially when dealing with Customers with facilities in more than one service territory. Requiring the ESP/MSP or Customer to purchase the equipment also adds a potentially significant cost and may be a barrier for many Customers who otherwise might seek alternative suppliers. In California, CT/VTs are treated as part of the UDC distribution system and ownership and maintenance responsibilities are retained by the UDC. RECOMMENDATION: The Metering Working Group should look at the intent of the language in the competition rules regarding equipment ownership and make a determination on CT/VT ownership that all UDCs can implement on a consistent basis. 3/14/00 Action: APS/TEP will investigate whether they can agree to own CT/VT's above the secondary voltage level (600 volts or less). (This will not require a rule change...it will require a tariff change). Action: APS will determine amount of primary customer accounts.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1		Pending	

3/00 Revision 10
WG Master Issues List

48

Issue: Can the customer own their own CT/PT's?
Need clarification of the rules.

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
						<p>5-9-00 APS communicated that they are changing their position regarding the ownership of CT/PTs. Position statement is as follows: "APS is agreeable to retaining ownership of CT/'sPT's for Direct Access locations provide tariff and operational issues impacted by this change ar effectively and equitably resolved.</p> <p>TEP - Sulfer Sprngs, Navopache and Mohave prefer the rules to stay as is regarding CT/PT ownership however, they will be willing to review suggested rule change.</p> <p>APSES – Recommending rule language change to add "...at the discretion of the customer" at the end of the first sentence of section R14-2-1612.k section 10.</p> <p>Action Items: Jim Wontor (APSES) will send out proposed language to PSWG participants by 5-10-00. Participants will come prepared to the 5-23-00 meeting with their company position on the proposed language.</p>				
{ TC "34" }34	There is no formalized process to report meter exceptions between UDCs and ESPs. (Examples: agreement metering programming, if MI/MAC forms are not completely filled out, etc. See MADEN for details on exception reasons.)	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See Issue 52	<p>Janie will provide information regarding this.</p> <p>Proposed Resolutions: It has been agreed that a formal communication method (similar to MADEN) will be utilized. The details of what data elements/guidelines will be discussed in both the metering & billing subcommittees.</p>	<p>Policy Subcommittee</p> <p>Priority #3</p>			Pending Resolution

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "52" }52	UDCs and market participants need a clearly-defined communication process for promptly communicating and resolving problems with data, meters, or bills among ESPs, MSPs, MRSPs, and the UDCs	1/25/00	APSES		See Issue 34	This process should be initiated by any participant to establish communication to solve the problem within a defined time frame, if possible, and, if necessary, to maintain communication until root cause analysis is complete. The a standardized process should be implemented immediately by each participant and automated by all parties as soon as possible. An example of the California "MADEN" process is attached to the original change control document. This process will reduce meter and data errors that cause billing errors and delays in billing and receiving revenue. It will help provide customer satisfaction by reducing billing questions and complaints to both UDCs and ESPs .	Policy Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending
{ TC "38" }38	Will the UDCs allow ESPs to interrogate meters on non-DA customers for load research purposes/ billing option purposes?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Janie will clarify at the 3/13/00 meeting. Details on Issue: Customer is not DA and wants load research data for informational purposes Example: ESP may be taking multiple customer accounts but not all of them. The ESP would like a secondary password to review this information so they can provide the information of all sites (even those not going DA) to the customer. If there is no IDR meter at the site, the customer would need to initiate an IDR meter from the UDC and pay the associated costs.	Policy Issue Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "46" }46	All Arizona EDI (DASRs, 867, 810, 650) should utilize GMT for the business transactions and local time for the enveloping. To avoid problems and unnecessary costs to conform to national standardization in the future, standard time references should be implemented immediately by each UDC, and EDI mapping can be phased in.	1/25/00	APSES		4/25/00	<p>This change would help market participants, particularly MDMAs/MRSPs, to save costs by not having to adapt their systems to Arizona's unique requirements.</p> <p>Action Item: All participants need to see what the use of GMT will do to their systems.</p> <p>2/16/00 Proposal: All participants will use GMT format for all transactions that require a time stamp.</p> <p>Action: find out how long the conversion to the GMT format will take.</p> <p>The group came to consensus</p> <p>Recommendation: All Arizona EDI transaction set data content will utilize GMT time and GMT time code. The enveloping of the EDI transactions will utilize the sender's local time. Implementation Issue: This recommendation refers to the ACC rule that states data transmission will be sent in Arizona time.</p> <p>The Policy Group will recommend a change to the ACC Rules.</p> <p>3/28/00 Determined this is not a rule change it is actually noted in the CC&N's.</p> <p>Action: Paul will talk with the ACC to determine what needs to take place to get the issue resolved. Can staff just send a notice to the existing certified entities advising them of the change to GMT?</p> <p>4/25/00 Need to review new proposition – be prepared to</p>	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1	X		Pending Resolution

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "47" }47	Standardization of Billing Options (ESP and UDC consolidated billing as well as Dual billing) from all UDCs should be implemented immediately to provide customer choice. Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures.	1/25/00	APSES			A working group of market participants should study the intent of the Commission Rules and make a determination that applies to all UDCs. The Terms and Conditions for credit, payments and partial payments, and other billing processes should be standardized for all UDCs. During the direct access rulemaking process, an earlier working group discussed whether billing options should be discretionary, but no consistent position was reached. Market participants need to clarify the procedures for consistency among UDCs. In order to develop a viable direct access market, the limitations on customer choice caused by differences in billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion and criticism will be reduced, and ESPs will have flexibility to meet individual customer needs.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #2			Pending

POLICY ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "48" }48	<p>For all Billing and Metering data, UDCs should employ the same rule and/or formula for rounding up data and rounding in calculations. The business process should be implemented immediately by each UDC.</p> <p>Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures.</p> <p>Resolution: No standardization needed.</p>	1/25/00	APSES		2/29/00	<p>In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by differences in data and billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion will be reduced.</p> <p>Action Items: All participants need to investigate what their rounding processes are on meter reading and billing. They also need to investigate how their CIS/MDMA systems handle rounding.</p> <p>2/16/00 Jim will provide more examples to help define the issue.</p> <p>2/22/00 Jim brought examples of rounding issues. Jim found that these issues were not widespread and the magnitude is fairly small. These issues will be discussed with the individual UDCs. Pending resolution at the 2/29/00 meeting</p>	<p>Policy Subcommittee</p> <p>Priority #1</p>	X		Resolved

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "55" }55	UDC fees for Direct Access services (CISR, DASR, metering, meter reading, billing, settlement, etc.) are too high and not consistent between UDCs.	1/25/00	APSES			<p>DISCUSSION: The 3 largest UDCs have proposed varying fees for Direct Access services, such as for meter information, for submitting Direct Access Service Requests, for meter installations or removals, for meter reading services, for consolidated and/or dual billing, and for settlement billing. These fees are, in some cases, excessively high and do not reflect the true marginal cost of providing these services. Many fees are required by one UDC, but not at all by the other UDCs. Even when required by all UDCs for the same service, the fees are not consistent and vary quite substantially. All of the additional fees provide an additional barrier to the development of a competitive market in Arizona.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: In order for a viable market to develop in Arizona, a group consisting of market participants should be tasked with determining which fees should be mandatory, which fees should be discretionary, and which fees should be deferred until the market has developed. This group should also recommend which costs could be recovered as part of base rates and which should be recovered in service fees. Finally, the group should recommend a consistent, cost-based methodology for calculating the costs to be recovered by the UDCs.</p>	Policy Subcommittee Priority #2			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "56" }56	Non-availability of local alternatives for providing competitively priced metering services.	1/25/00	APSES		See Issue 28 & 36	Currently, there are very few Meter Service Providers (MSPs) or Meter Reading Service Providers (MRSPs) that have facilities and personnel in Arizona. Most of the certificated providers are based out-of-state and cannot, by ACC rules, subcontract with non-certificated personnel in the state. This potentially drives up the cost of some services that require personnel to travel to Arizona. Additionally, since the UDCs cannot provide competitive metering services beyond the year 2000, most have chosen not to provide a full menu of services during the year 2000. Both of these factors produce situations where the cost of providing competitive metering services are higher than they would be if they were provided by personnel already located in the state. The Policy Working Group should recommend that, to stimulate the market and the cost effective provision of competitive services, the following changes should be made: <div>1. UDCs should be allowed to provide competitive metering services at a competitive market price, and</div> <div>2. MSP/MRSPs should be allowed to subcontract for services to qualified personnel, without having to make them employees of the company, as long as the certificated MSP/MRSP is still responsible for the work they perform.</div> 3/14/00 Barb Klemstine will change the wording on the MSP qualifications/requirements that is attached to the CC&N in regards to item 3. She will include wording so that the MSP & their agents will be held to the same rules.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #2		Pending	

3/00 Revision 10
WG Master Issues List

55

White Paper Results:

1. TEP & APS agree – waiver will be needed

2. TEP & APS don't agree due to procurement & labor issues

POLICY ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
56 (cont.)	Non-availability of local alternatives for providing competitively priced metering services.	1/25/00	APSES		See Issue 28 & 36	4/11/00 Be prepared to discuss item #2 (subcontracting) for the next meeting. 5-9-00 Bob Grey will check with Deb to check on the status of this issue.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #2			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "28" }28	Clarification on when an UDC can be an MSP. Both sets of Direct Access rules have different definitions. (ACC Rules and HB 2663)	1/26/00	DASR Subcommittee		See Issue 56 & 36	<p>1/26/00 For example, in APS territory they cannot be an MSP for any customer except under 20 kW and residential customer.</p> <p>Additionally, when are meter exchanges required within the service territories.</p> <p>2/1/2000 – In service territory's governed by the ACC Competition Rules: See section R14-2-1615-B. On January 1, 2001 no affected utility can offer competitive services.</p> <p>Issue still remaining: What if there are no service providers offering these services at a competitive rate after 1/1/01 that make it cost effective for customers to switch? This is a Commission and Legislative issue.</p> <p>Barbara Klemstine: Will provide a proposal to the group next week showing why the UDC can be an MSP.</p> <p>Action: take Barbara's "white pages" to our companies to see if any problems/issues with the document. Be prepared to discuss next week. May need to create a waiver for this.</p> <p>Action: APS to determine implementation issues regarding issues #28, #36, & #56</p> <p>Barry Scott does not want a rule written that the choice of the MSP has to be chosen by the ESP. It should be the customer's choice.</p>	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending There is still the issue remaining which will be included on the ACC report.

POLICY ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "36" }36	ACC Rules Question: Can the UDC provide metering and installation services for DA customer? Short term and after January 1, 2001?	1/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		See issue # 56 & 28	Action Item: Participants need to read the ACC and HB2663 and be prepared to discuss issue.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending
{ TC "61" }61	Who is <u>the "due process" responsible</u> for tracking the performance of MSP's and MRSP's? -What is the process for communicating this information? <u>Who do we report the problems too? What are the processes once the complaint has been made? Etc.</u>	2/8/00	Billing Subcommittee			<u>6/22/00 Be prepared to discuss issue for next months meeting.</u>	Policy Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending <u>for July meeting</u>
{ TC "69" }69	What is the enforceability of the recommended processes or rules of non-ACC jurisdictional entities?	2/17/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			Where does an ESP file noncompliance complaints for those entities that are not governed by the ACC rulings?	Policy Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending
{ TC "70" }70	A utility can back-bill a 3 rd party (if the 3 rd party is at fault) up to 12 months (R14-212-e3). This is only specific to the utility. Should the rule be applicable to other participants other than just the utility?	2/22/00	Policy Group			Should this Rule be modified to allow all parties providing meter data to be back-billed by the recipients of the incorrect data?	Policy Subcommittee Priority #3			Pending

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "73" }73	Is NERC using Standard Central Time in Non-EDI transactions? Why is NERC using Standard Central Time and should we be using it?	2/29/00	Policy Subcommittee			3/7/00 Address once NERC has made their decision on which standard time to use. <u>Suggestions:</u> Send a letter to NERC recommending GMT. <u>Action:</u> talk w/ your companies to see if support the GMT format (issue #46) as a standard so can file for a joint waiver. E-mail to Evelyn by 3/13/00. Evelyn will write the waiver to present to the ACC. Yes, NERC is using Central Standard Time 3/28/00 Action: Shirley & Jim will flow out process' for converting data to Standard Time Zones.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending
{ TC "74" }74	Navapahce will be submitting a report to the PSWG regarding what their business processes will be for DA.	3/2/00	Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			How should this report be represented in the 6/15/00 ACC report? This opportunity may need to be offered to all cooperatives. 4/25/00 Per Dan Laos, this issue became a cooperative response. The executive summary has been submitted to the Policy Sub.	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending Resolution.

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "77" }77	The UMI was presumed to be the national standard for identifying a single meter. However, it's not being used by any other state in the dereg market. Furthermore most of the EDI documents are not implementing a UMI number.	3/16/00	Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee		3/28/00	<p>Representatives from New West Energy, APSES, 1st Point and Schlumberger are not using this number.</p> <p>It was suggested that this number no be implemented as an Arizona standard.</p> <p>3/28/00 APSES does not need the UMI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Jim W advised that the UMI is not being used by MSP's (First Point & Schlumberger) in CA.- This is not an industry standard that we thought it would be.- No compelling reason for market participants to use the UMI standard. <p>Proposition: Request that the Utilities Director remove the requirement of using the UMI standard from the 5/1/99 report.</p>	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Resolved

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "78" }78	There is no language in the rules keeping the MSP from contracting directly with the customers, how should this issue be addressed?	3/28/00	Policy Group			<p>System implications – Will the MSP have to submit DASR's?</p> <p>Rule change suggestion: Change the definition in Section R14-2-1601 DASR – means a form that contains all necessary billing and metering information to allow customers to switch electric service providers. This form must be submitted to the Utility Distribution Company <i>by the customer's load serving entity</i> (instead of what it currently says: by the customer's Electric Service Provider).</p> <p>This may force the UDCs to create contracts for MSPs. The ESP would send the DASR but they would not be liable for the MSP. The contract would allow the UDC to hold the MSP liable.</p> <p>Action Item: All participants to assess the impacts of an MSP contracting directly with the customer. Come back to the Policy meeting with their company's position on this issue. Be prepared to provide solutions to this issue at the next meeting.</p> <p>5-9-00 TEP agrees that there is no language in the rules that precludes the customer contracting directly with the MSP. TEP would like to see language added rules that would not allow a customer to contract directly with an MSP.</p> <p>APS identified the contractual and system impacts if the customer contracts directly with the MSP. Systems and processes were developed to transmit DASR directly with the ESP only.</p> <p>APSES would lean towards the customer not subcontracting directly with the MSP. MSPs should work through the ESP so the customer doesn't end up with a metering system that the ESP or MRSP can not read.</p>	Policy Subcommittee Priority #1			Pending (Tabled)

POLICY ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
78 CONT	<u>There is no language in the rules keeping the MSP from contracting directly with the customers, how should this issue be addressed</u>	<u>3/28/00</u>	<u>Policy Group</u>			<u>Navopache and Mohave, Sulfer Springs and AEPCO & Trico -Customer choice is paramount in competition. Therefore, there should be no language added to the competition rules that would prohibit an MSP from contracting directly with the customer. Although the coops want to ensure that their current status under the rules is maintained, the Co-ops would not be opposed to the Investor Owned Utilities desire to add language to the rules which would not allow the customer to contract directly with the MSP in the service territory of the IOUs only..</u> <u>APSES has concerns that the customer may be purchasing metering equipment that can not be supprted by the MRSP and the MSP.</u> <u>Consensus was not reached on how to address this issue. At this time the issue will be tabled until further notice.</u> <u>6/22/00</u> <u>Action: Each entity to send their "position papers" to Evilyn by 6//30/00</u> <u>ACC staff will take this issue and provide clarification of intent of allowing the MSP to contract with the customer.</u>	<u>Policy Subcommittee</u> <u>Priority #1</u>			<u>Pending For July Meeting</u>

POLICY ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "78" }78	There is no language in the rules keeping the MSP from contracting directly with the customers, how should this issue be addressed?	3/28/00	Policy Group			Navopache and Mohave, Sulfer Springs and AEPCO & Trico – Customer choice is paramount in competition. Therefore, there should be no language added to the competition rules that would prohibit an MSP from contracting directly with the customer. Although the coops want to ensure that their current status under the rules is maintained, the Co-ops would not be opposed to the Investor Owned Utilities desire to add language to the rules which would not allow the customer to contract directly with the MSP in the service territory of the IOUs only. APSES has concerns that the customer may be purchasing metering equipment that can not be supplied by the MRSP and the MSP. Consensus was not reached on how to address this issue. At this time the issue will be tabled until further notice.				
{ TC "79" }79	Explore additional electronic methods for transmitting metering data.	4/27/00	Meter Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee			The group has a short-term method of transmitting data via email with Excel spreadsheets. The market participants would like other methods explored.	Metering subcommittee			Pending
{ TC "80" }80 New	What are the security and encryption standards that will be used in transmitting data.	5/9/00	Barry Scott			6/22/00 Barry Scott to provide facilitated discussion regarding this issue.	Policy Group	Priority #1		Pending for July meeting
{ TC "81" }81 New	What information is provided on a CISR from each UDC and is that information consistent.	5/9/00	Jim Wontor – APSES				DASR Group	Priority #3		Pending

POLICY ISSUES

Issue #	Issue	Date Issue was Identified	Identified by	Need by Date	Date Issue Resolved	Discussion	Group Assignment	Report Assignment		Status
								Report	ACC	
{ TC "82" }82 New	Prior Balances – In the models for ESP consolidated Billing being suggested, once the customer bills, the receivable is transferred to a holding account for the ESP to pay off.	5/24/00	Billing Subcommittee			What happens when a customer disputes the receivable? The ESP will only pay the undisputed amount and there is no way for the UDC to identify what and whose balance is being disputed. Action Items : APS and TEP to bring their account receivable models for ESP Consolidated Billing. ESP to report on possible impacts of different accounts receivable processing.	Billing Subcommittee			
83	MRSP Certification needs to be revamped to test the ability of the MRSP. A proposed option to test the MRSP may be to send production data from an active meter. A committee should be formed to establish a realistic process to test and access the performance of an MRSP's. Best practices should be the foundation in formulating the performance standards.	6/22/00	Metering Subcommittee				Policy Group	Priority #1	Pending	